Beyer, did you have...did you want a point of personal privilege?

SENATOR BEYER: Mr. Speaker and colleagues, point of personal privilege. It's again my pleasure this year to place on your desk a small token of appreciation from the Nebraska Ag Women whose base is in my district, it's Springfield, Nebraska. Nebraska Agri Women is an affiliate of the American Women and was formed in January 25th of 1973. And since this is our Ag Week and everything, it was just the opportune time to present this and I hope you do appreciate it. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Beyer. While the Legislature is in session and capable of transacting business, I propose to sign and do sign LR 23. I also would like to announce some quests of Senator Chizek. There are 62 eighth graders from Mary Our Queen School in Omaha and their teachers. They are in the north balcony. Would you people please stand and be welcomed by the Legislature. Thanks for being with us. Mr. Clerk, we will now proceed to item 7, Final Reading. We will pass over LB 234 because Senator Landis is not here. We will go then to LB 344.

CLERK: Mr. President, LB 344 is on Final Reading. I do have a motion to return the bill from Senator Beutler. The amendment that Senator Beutler would offer, Mr. President, is to restore to the bill the entire section beginning with the word, "any" in line 17, on page 101.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, first of all, Mr. Clerk, that would be the entire sentence, not the entire section. Sorry for the poor handwriting. Members of the Legislature, on page 101 of your bill, there is a penalty provision that's deleted and that penalty provision is a Class II misdemeanor penalty provision which applies to that particular section of the bill which is Section 48, which has to attempting to evade taxes on alcoholic do with evading or liquor. And talking with the staff of the committee, it seems that the intent was not to delete that particular class of misdemeanor for that particular section that I just described to you but ratner to delete it simply for another portion of that section which was itself deleted from the bill. So, in other words, I think this is merely a technical matter but it needs to be corrected, at least in my opinion, because it changes...if we